

(will there be a record of this meeting? may I make an electronic recording?)

- I. what is the result of the site's reassessment for dioxin risk?
- II. what is the outcome of the discontinuance of on-site H<sub>2</sub>O injection "pilot study" and recommendation for the "study" going forward?
  - A. Was sufficient data gathered to account for wide variations year-to-year of rainfall, other variables not analyzable in short term.
- III. what is the outcome of the new Arkwood conceptual site model creation process?
  - A. New Conceptual Site Model
    1. Includes timeframe for return to use of all affected lands?
- IV. what is EPA's status on Institutional Control (aka "Deed Notice" or "Deed Restriction") for Arkwood
  - A. existing recorded IC was worded and approved by EPA's Don Williams and recorded by my father the owner of Arkwood on August 30, 2010 in Boone Co., Arkansas
  - B. what are the EPA-required modifications to IC
  - C.
- V. If agreement regarding the cleanup is complete and satisfied between parties, could EPA covenant with McKesson or other PRP promising not to sue, as per Ms. Moran in telephone conversation of March 25, 2013?
- VI. where do beneficiaries of estate who come into ownership of superfund site stand in liability chain?
- VII. what is status of SWRAU certification and Casey Lockett-Snyder's statements?

VIII. redraw Arkwood “site” boundaries and determine new legal description

A. clarification of the site's actual boundaries and legal description per the new conceptual site model

1. compare: 1988 Consent Decree description (18.076 acres), 1990 ROD maps and description (“approximately 15 acres”), “survey for McKesson Inc” dated 30 June 2009 with expanded boundary (30.74 acres), EPA R6 aerial map with expanded boundary created 17 November 2009 (30.74 acres)

B. obtain new survey based upon new model

C. move fencing to enclose only redefined site

IX. release balance of property for industrial or commercial use

X. letters from EPA to McKesson to state unaffected surround lands are just that - unaffected and uninvolved

A. no known issue of sedimentation or runoff issues,

B. no record or evidence of any threat to remedy posed by any adjacent site activities

1. e.g. cutting timber, building houses and businesses, any other legal use